

Appl. No. 10/648,898
Amdt. dated April 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2004

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Applicants submit herewith replacement drawings in which new Fig. 3, reference numbers and additional structure have been added. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and the rejection of claims 1-14 are respectfully requested. Applicants have attempted to address every objection and ground for rejection in the Office Action dated December 29, 2004 (Paper No. 3) and believe the application is now in condition for allowance. The claims have been amended to more clearly describe the present invention.

The drawings stand objected to for failing to show certain claimed features. Applicants have canceled claims 4 and 5 reciting the ski jump and the spectator area, have schematically inserted the snow/ice generator of claim 13, and added reference number 14 to refer to the solar cells on the roof of the parking area, since the structure was already evident in the drawings as filed. Replacement drawings are enclosed. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dean et al (US 3,250,530). Dean discloses a year-round ski facility including enclosed ski runs with ski lift equipment, air conditioning units, snow producing equipment and associated support buildings. However, Dean fails to disclose or suggest any sort of means for interactively coupling the participants.

In contrast, claim 1 has been amended by incorporating features of canceled claim 9 and among other things, now recites means for interactively coupling the participants engaging in at least one of said active devices, wherein the result of use of at

least one of said active devices by participants in said at least one winter facility is interactively coupled to the activity of one or more other participants using the same or another active device in the same or another said at least one winter facility. Dean fails to disclose or suggest any sort of interactive coupling means as now recited. Further, there is no incentive in Dean to make the necessary modifications to what was disclosed to arrive at the structure now recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection based on Dean is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3-7, 10, 11, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Dean et al. The arguments asserted above traversing Dean are reasserted here. Since the claims subject to this rejection all depend from claim 1, which has now been amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Dean's failure to disclose or suggest, among other things, the recited interactive coupling means for the participants, applies to these claims as well. As such, the Section 103 rejection is respectfully traversed.

In addition, Applicants have provided new claims 15-17, ultimately depending from claim 1 and further reciting structure used in the preferred embodiment for implementing the recited interactive coupling. Support for this subject matter, which is now also shown in amended Figs. 1 and 3, is found on pages 10 and 11 of the present specification. Applicants respectfully submit that Dean or any of the other references of record fail to disclose or suggest the newly claimed subject matter.

